

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated February 22, 2006 has been reviewed, and the comments of the U.S. Patent Office have been considered. Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended, and dependent claims 3-12 have been added. The amendments to claim 1 are supported in the specification by, at least, paragraphs [0539], [0556], and [0606]. New dependent claims 3-12 correspond to dependent claims 2-4, 6-7, and 9-10 of co-pending application No. 10/736,901.

The amendments to the specification update paragraph [0001] with patent numbers corresponding to the listed patent applications. Also, some of the applications identified in paragraph [0001] are no longer commonly assigned to the assignee of the above-identified application. No new matter has been added.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Shimizu (JP Patent No. 2002186120 A) (a computer-generated English-language translation of Shimizu is attached hereto); and claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shimizu in view of Hsu (U.S. Patent No. 6,380,648) and further in view of a document identified as "UQM Technologies." The rejections are respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 1, Shimizu fails to show or describe a vehicle having at least one motor comprising two or more electromagnetic power circuits that provide power to the motor, the circuits sufficiently isolated to substantially eliminate electromagnetic and electrical interference between the circuits. Shimizu at Fig. 3 and paragraph [0039] shows that the Shimizu vehicle has eight motors (motors 30-37) but Shimizu otherwise fails to show or describe whether at least one of those motors has two or more electromagnetic power circuits because the interior composition of each motor is not shown or described. Fig. 3 shows only a box representative of each motor, without providing any details as to whether any motor comprises two or more electromagnetic power circuits.

The Office Action at pages 3-4 appears to interpret Shimizu's motors 30-37 to have two or more electromagnetic circuits because of the wiring externally connecting inverters 10, 10', 11, 11', 12, 12', 13, and 13' to motors 30-37, respectively. However, as shown in Fig. 3, each motor is connected to only a single inverter. Shimizu thus fails to show or describe two or more electromagnetic power circuits that provide power to a motor.

Furthermore, Shimizu's inverters are electrically connected to each other and are thus not circuits that are isolated or designed to substantially eliminate electromagnetic and electrical interference between the circuits. As shown in Fig. 3, each line (drawn as a double line) extending from the battery-side of each inverter connects at common nodes. See, e.g., the node in Fig. 3 just to the bottom right of inverter 10'. Shimizu's inverters also connect to each other at node N10. See paragraph [0079]. Thus, each inverter is shown and described as sharing a common electrical connection with at least another inverter. Shimizu at paragraph [0041] confirms that the common electrical connection is utilized for the inverter where it describes that the power supplied by common battery 6 is connected to motors 30-37 and inverters 10', 11, 11', 12, 12', 13, and 13'. Shimizu thus fails to show or describe electromagnetic power circuits that provide power and that are sufficiently isolated to substantially eliminate electromagnetic and electrical interference between the circuits, as recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that the recited electromagnetic circuits are power circuits. Shimizu is limited to multiple control circuits, and does not show or describe two or more power circuits.

With regard to claim 2, the Office Action has not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The Office Action at page 4 acknowledges that Shimizu fails to disclose a motor having groups of stator core elements structurally and electromagnetically isolated from the stator core elements in other groups, and asserts that Hsu at Figs. 1-5 and what "is known in the art" teach these features. However, Hsu does not show or describe a motor having structurally and electromagnetically isolated groups of stator core elements. Hsu at Fig. 6A-6B shows a ring portion end 211 that structurally connects one coil with another. Hsu at col. 5, lines 16-22, describes the assembly of ring portion end 211 with a plurality of stator coils 413 and 414 to form a structurally integrated inner stator portion 21. Hsu also describes at col. 3, lines 64-66, that inner stator portion 21 is magnetically permeable, with no teaching or suggestion of electromagnetic isolation. Hsu thus fails to teach or suggest a motor having groups of stator core elements that are structurally and electromagnetically isolated from other groups. Applicants also respectfully traverse the Office Action's assertion that the above-described features is known in the art, as this assertion is not supported by Hsu and because no other support for the assertion is identified in the Office Action.

Furthermore, UQM Technologies does not qualify as prior art as acknowledged by the Patent Office at page 9 of the May 24, 2006 Office Action for co-pending application No. 10/359,305. Specifically, Applicants claim priority to provisional application No. 60/399,415 filed July 31, 2002. UQM Technologies bears a date of September 17, 2002, which is after Applicants' provisional priority date of July 31, 2002. Accordingly, UQM Technologies does not qualify as prior art.

For the foregoing reasons, Shimizu fails to show or describe all of the features recited in independent claim 1. Furthermore, for independent claim 2, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because Hsu fails to teach or suggest the features missing from Shimizu, and because the rejection relies on a reference that does not qualify as prior art. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

According to page 3 of the May 5, 2005 Office Action, claim 1 stands provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 on alleged double-patenting grounds over claim 1 of co-pending application No. 10/736,901. This provisional rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 of co-pending application No. 10/736,901 was amended on November 25, 2005 after the double-patenting rejection was asserted, and claim 1 of the above-identified application is not coextensive in scope with claim 1 of co-pending application No. 10/736,901. Accordingly, consistent with MPEP §804.02, it is respectfully requested that the double-patenting rejection be withdrawn. With the traversal of the statutory-based double-patenting rejection, the Office bears the burden to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for any obviousness-type double-patenting rejection. *See* MPEP §804(II) and §804.02(I).

New dependent claims 3-12 recite features already familiar to the Examiner in co-pending application No. 10/736,901. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 3-12 are allowable for at least the reasons provided above for independent claims 1-2.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this Application and the prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of the application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-3840. **This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).**

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Laub
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 38,708

Date: October 30, 2006
Patent Administrator
Proskauer Rose LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202.416.6800
Facsimile: 202.416.6899
CUSTOMER NO: 61263

Customer No. 61263

Enclosure: Computer-generated English-language translation of JP Patent No. 2002186120 A